

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
OXFORD DIVISION**

MICHAEL POWELL

PLAINTIFF

v.

No. 3:19CV23-DAS

FRANK SHAW, ET AL.

DEFENDANTS

**ORDER *DENYING* PLAINTIFF'S
MOTIONS [38], [47], [48], [49] TO AMEND COMPLAINT**

This matter comes before the court on the motions [38], [47], [48], [49] by the plaintiff to amend his complaint. Although not automatic, the decision to grant or deny leave to amend a pleading is within the sound discretion of the district court. *Bloom v. Bexar County, Texas*, 130 F.3d 722, 727 (5th Cir. 1997), *Halbert v. City of Sherman*, 33 F.3d 526, 529 (5th Cir. 1994). A party may amend a pleading as a matter of course within “21 days after service of a responsive pleading.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)(B). In this case, the various motions [38], [47], [48], [49] to amend were filed long after the defendants’ July 1, 2019, answer. In addition, the amendments largely seek to add two defendants and an unrelated claim. For these reasons, the motions [38], [47], [48], [49] are not well taken and are **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this, the 18th day of March, 2021.

/s/ David A. Sanders

DAVID A. SANDERS

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE